

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
EUREKA DIVISION

JENNIFER TOM,
Plaintiff,

v.

ANDREW SAUL,
Defendant.

Case No. 19-cv-06322-JST (RMI)

ORDER

Re: Dkt. No. 93

Now pending before the court is a document filed by Plaintiff that is essentially a motion to compel discovery, but styled as a “Response” to a motion that was previously filed by Plaintiff herself and that has already been denied by the court. *See* Pl.’s Mot. (dkt. 93) at 6 (“There is a need for the court to step in because Plaintiff is unable to get Defendant to act in good faith and provide Plaintiff with all her webTA records as agreed to in ECF 83.”). As an attachment to her latest filing, Plaintiff has included certain correspondence from Defendant’s counsel stating in pertinent part that the items which Plaintiff contends were missing from the document production have now been gathered and uploaded to a location where Plaintiff can access them. *See id.* at 20.

In a recently filed order, dated April 15, 2021, the undersigned directed Plaintiff to familiarize herself with the procedure for presenting discovery disputes by way of jointly-filed letter briefs, as set forth in ¶13 of the undersigned’s General Standing Order; furthermore, the undersigned admonished Plaintiff to view the court as a last resort for resolving discovery disputes, not a first resort. *See* Order (dkt. 90) at 1-2. Accordingly, because Plaintiff’s recently-filed “Response” (dkt. 93) is in fact yet another improperly filed (and likely unnecessary) motion to compel, the motion is **DENIED**, and Plaintiff is once again directed to read and comply with

the directions set forth in the court's previous order (dkt. 90).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 21, 2021

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'RMILLMAN', is written over a horizontal line.

ROBERT M. ILLMAN
United States Magistrate Judge

United States District Court
Northern District of California